REMARKS

This is a response to the office action issued May 30, 2006. The examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Harrada et al. The applicants respectfully disagree for reasons explained hereinafter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Harada does not anticipate the claimed invention. Harada does not teach the step of moderating (step (b) in claim 1 for example). The moderating step (b) of claim 1 and similar claims of the present invention moderates (i.e., reduces) the display space requirement (DSR) values of the larger elements with reference to the DSR values of the other elements in the corresponding column or row. The moderated DSR values are then used for calculating column widths and row heights. Thus, moderating DSR values and using the moderated DSR values for calculating column widths and row heights are new, non-obvious and well defined methods of the present invention which provide the benefit of optimal rather than wasteful allocation of display space. Harada is different from the present invention because it lacks the step for determining the moderated DSR values and it does not calculate column widths and row heights based on moderated DSR values.

Also, Harada teaches away from the present invention as it teaches changing row and column arrangement of cells and also teaches adding or dropping entire cells and information within cells based on user input. Changing the arrangement of cells (e.g., moving a cell in column 7 of row 1 to column 1 of row 3) or adding and deleting cells and information in matrices such as tables and spreadsheets can destroy the integrity of the tables or spreadsheets. On the other hand, the present invention does not teach changing the row or column arrangement of cells, does not teach adding or deleting cells & information and, instead, aims to allocate space optimally and display the information array elements in the corresponding cells within the predetermined two dimensional display space.

9

In line nos. 7-12 on page 3 of the Office Action dated May 30, 2006, the Examiner alleges that Harada teaches determining moderated DSR value of elements since Harada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells. Applicants respectfully disagree. Harada teaches that, "optimum cell size is determined on condition that the particular cell layout restrictive conditions are satisfied and an information volume of each particular cell is equal to or slightly larger than the maximum information volume". The cell layout restrictive conditions specified by Harada are as follows: a) the ratio of cell height to width should be approximately equal to 1; b) cell character width should be slightly greater than or equal to one group of program elements actually arranged in each cell; and c) the number of cells arranged in a table is as large as possible. Thus, based on these teachings of Harada it is clear that "determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells" has nothing to do with determining moderated DSR value and thus the Examiner's allegations are incorrect.

In line nos. 15-17 on page 3 of the Office Action dated May 30, 2006, the Examiner alleges that Harada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values. Applicants respectfully disagree. In view of the fact that neither Harada nor any other cited prior art teaches "determining moderated DSR value", it is impossible that "Harada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values".

The measuring of the lopsidedness in some of the claims (see for example claim 17) is not taught by Harada and other prior art. This is an additional step which optimally determines whether column widths or row heights will be allocated first in step (d). Harada does not teach the step of measuring the lopsidedness of distribution of information elements and using that as a basis for determining first allocation of column widths or row heights.

In line nos. 1-6 on page 7 of the Office Action dated May 30, 2006, the Examiner alleges that "Harada teaches determining the optimum distribution of elements across columns and across rows, i.e., the X and Y axis; and allocating cell widths based on the

10

X or Y axis restrictive condition, i.e. row heights or column widths, respectively" compare to "measuring the lopsidedness of distribution of larger elements across columns and across rows;" and correspondingly allocating column widths or row heights, as taught by the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Harada does not describe nor even mention the concept of lopsidedness of distribution of elements across columns and across rows. Thus it is not possible that Harada teaches "measuring the lopsidedness" .

Thus, as to claim 1 and similar claims, Wallack, Kanevsky and Harada, either individually or combined, do not teach allocating column widths and row heights, based on the ModDSR values or on values obtained by using the ModDSR values, such that the total width of all the columns and the total height of all the rows do not exceed the width and height, respectively, of the predetermined two dimensional display space.

As to claim 17 and similar claims, Wallack, Kanevsky and Harada, either individually or combined, do not teach measuring the lopsidedness.

As to claim 22 and similar claims, Wallack, Kanevsky and Harada, either individually or combined, do not teach the checking step (b). This step checks whether the information array can be displayed in Matrix Format. If the information array cannot be displayed in Matrix Format then the subsequent steps are executed to display the information array in Tall or Wall Format.

For these reasons, the examiner will see that the claims as amended are allowable. The examiner is respectfully requested to place the case in condition for allowance at her earliest convenience.

11

Respectfully submitted,

————————————————
Jay P. Kesan (Reg. No. 37,488)
2709 Windward Blvd.
Champaign, IL 61821
(217)333-7887

This paper is being submitted by United States First Class Mail addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 with
sufficient postage on:

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Name: _____

12